

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

ORDER

AND NOW, this 19th day of September, 2006, upon consideration of *pro se* plaintiff's motion to vacate (Doc. 90), seeking reconsideration of the order of court dated May 3, 2004 (Doc. 36), which dismissed all claims against Judge Carol Van Horn and Judge John R. Walker, and it appearing that there are no manifest errors of law or fact in the challenged order, see Harsco Corp. v. Zlotnicki, 779 F.2d 906, 909 (3d Cir. 1985) ("The purpose of a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact"); see also Dodge v. Susquehanna Univ., 796 F. Supp. 829, 830 (M.D. Pa. 1992) (cautioning that mere disagreement with the court does not translate into a clear error of law), and that plaintiff filed the instant motion over two years after the entry of the challenged order, see L.R. 7.10 ("Any motion for reconsideration or reargument shall be filed within ten (10) days after

the entry of the judgment, order or decree concerned."), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion to vacate (Doc. 90) is CONSTRUED as a motion for reconsideration and is DENIED as so construed.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge